



**South Carolina
Department of
Probation, Parole and
Pardon Services**

ANNUAL STATISTICAL REPORT

**FISCAL YEAR
2012**

**KELA E. THOMAS
DIRECTOR**

Proprietary Disclaimer

This document (including all data and statistical information represented herein) was compiled and reported by the South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services. Any reproduction or republication of said report, data, or statistics is permitted only if reproduced in its entirety without modification, or omission, and must identify the South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services as the source.

Kela E. Thomas, Director

Post Office Box 50666
Columbia, South Carolina 29250
803-734-9220
www.dppps.sc.gov

Office of Executive Programs and Public Policy

Arnise Moultrie, Program Administrator

Division of Field Operations

Marchar Stagg, Statistical & Research Analyst

Message from the Director

I am pleased to present this year's Annual Statistical Report. As an agency, we accomplished benchmarked results, utilizing Evidence-Based Practices supervision strategies and focusing on mission-driven priorities. This report depicts the Department's successes and areas of greater opportunity.

The Annual Statistical Report for Fiscal Year 2012 has been compiled for your review and reference. This report provides a statistical representation of the work of 590 employees of the South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services (SCDPPPS) including 354 caseload carrying Agents. While there have been many challenges over the course of the year, I am pleased to report that 70% of our probationers and 91% of our parolees successfully completed supervision. The Bureau of Justice Statistics of the United States Department of Justice (2010) reported nationally that approximately 65% of probationers and 52% of parolees successfully met the conditions of their supervision.


This Department operates its offender programs within a clear framework of public safety in supervising the 46,374 offenders under our jurisdiction. We maintain a fundamental belief that given support, resources, and service interventions, the offender has the ability to make positive changes in his or her life.

In addition, our responses to offender risks and needs in the community are focused to address present or potential problems that may interfere with the successful completion of supervision without compromising public safety.

The following tables provide a description of the offender population and answer some commonly asked questions regarding the Department's programmatic efforts. Each table is preceded by a short description of its contents.

For additional information or clarification, please contact Arnise Moultrie in the Office of Executive Programs and Public Policy at 803-734-9220.

Sincerely,


Kela E. Thomas
Director

To the Reader

The reader should be aware that there are different ways of reporting units of data depending upon the purpose. Admissions include only those offenders admitted to SCDPPPS who had no other active cases at the time of admission. Closures information reflects only the last order to close during the fiscal year. The description of Actives represents only those offenders who had at least one active case on June 30, 2012.

Fiscal Year 2012 (FY 2012) began on July 1, 2011 and ended on June 30, 2012. At the end of FY 2012, there were 46,374 offenders under the legal jurisdiction of the Department. Legal jurisdiction includes offenders who were transferred out of state, absconded with active warrants, and others who are not under the active day-to-day supervision. At the end of the fiscal year, 32,671 offenders were under active supervision of the Department.

In addition, due to rounding, some of the totals will not equal 100%. Where possible, missing data or rounding has been indicated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION A---TOTAL POPULATION

TABLE 1-A	Total Admissions by Program Type	10
TABLE 2-A	Total Admissions by Type of Offense	11
TABLE 3-A	Total Admissions by Gender & Race	12
FIGURE 1	Total Admissions by Gender & Race	13
TABLE 4-A	Active Offenders by Level of Supervision	14
FIGURE 2	Active Offenders by Level of Supervision	15
TABLE 5-A	Total Closures by Type	16
TABLE 6-A	Total Admissions by Age	17

SECTION B---PROBATION

TABLE 1-B	Probation Admissions by Type of Offense	21
TABLE 2-B	Probation Admissions by Gender & Race	22
TABLE 3-B	Active Probation Offenders by Level of Supervision	23
FIGURE 3	Active Probation Offenders by Level of Supervision	24
TABLE 4-B	Probation Closures by Type	25
TABLE 5-B	Probation Admissions by Age	26

SECTION C---PAROLE

TABLE 1-C	Parole Admissions by Type of Offense	29
TABLE 2-C	Parole Admissions by Gender & Race	30
TABLE 3-C	Active Parole Offenders by Level of Supervision	31
FIGURE 4	Active Parole Offenders by Level of Supervision	32
TABLE 4-C	Parole Closures by Type	33
TABLE 5-C	Parole Admissions by Age	34

SECTION D---YOA

TABLE 1-D	YOA Admissions by Type of Offense	37
TABLE 2-D	YOA Admissions by Gender & Race	38
TABLE 3-D	Active YOA Offenders by Level of Supervision	39
FIGURE 5	Active YOA Offenders by Level of Supervision	40
TABLE 4-D	YOA Closures by Type	41
TABLE 5-D	YOA Admissions by Age	42

SECTION E---SEX OFFENDERS

TABLE 1-E	Active Sex Offenders	45
FIGURE 6	Active Sex Offenders	46

SECTION F---VIOLATIONS

TABLE 1-F	Violations by County	49
TABLE 2-F	Closures by Type	50

SECTION G---ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE

FIGURE 7	Offenders on Electronic Monitoring	53
FIGURE 8	Offenders on GPS	54

SECTION H---SUMMARY

TABLE 1-H	Offender Referrals	58
TABLE 2-H	DNA Collections by County	59
FIGURE 9	Monthly DNA Collections	60
TABLE 3-H	Offender Drug Testing	61
TABLE 4-H	Population Characteristics	62
FIGURE 10	Admissions: A 20-Year Comparison	63
FIGURE 11	Violent Admissions by Program Status	64

SECTION A

TOTAL POPULATION

FISCAL YEAR 2012

TOTAL POPULATION

Tables 1-A through 6-A and Figures 1 and 2, represent admissions to the SCDPPPS during FY 2012. These tables count admissions to a particular sanction, and include only those offenders admitted to SCDPPPS who had no other active cases at the time of admission. These tables also include only the main case even though an offender may have been admitted with more than one case. In FY 2012, there were 17,662 admissions. A state and county total is provided for each category of admission. Within the racial categories, due to the small number of offenders classified as "Asian, Hispanic, Native American, or Other", they have been grouped together and classified as "Other".

Table 1-A provides information on total admissions by program type. The counties of Charleston, Greenville, Richland and Spartanburg contributed the largest number of total admissions, together accounting for 36% of all admissions.

Explanation of Program Types

Probation: Includes Probation, Probation Termination Upon Payment (PTUP), Split Probation (admitted to probation with a split sentence from prison), Monitor for the Court, and Not Guilty by Reason of Insanity (NGRI).

Parole: Includes Parole, Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ), early release program, and Community Supervision Program cases.

YOA: Includes offenders sentences under the Youth Offender Act.

Table 2-A presents information on total admissions by type of offense, violent versus non-violent. Violent refers to those offenses as defined by the Omnibus Crime Act¹. Total admissions during the fiscal year were predominately non-violent with only 8% admissions for violent offenses. This figure is up one percentage point from last year.

Table 3-A and Figure 1 illustrate total admissions by gender and race. Admissions overall continue to be predominately male at 81%, with a racial composition of 53% black, 46% white, and 2% of other races.

¹Abuse or Neglect of a Vulnerable Adult, Arson, 1st & 2nd degree, Assault and Battery of a High & Aggravated Nature (offense on or after 06/02/2010), Assault and Battery with Intent to Kill, Assault with Intent to Commit Criminal Sexual Conduct 1st or 2nd degree, Attempted Murder, Burglary 1st and 2nd degree, Carjacking, Child Abuse, Criminal Domestic Violence of a High and Aggravated Nature, Criminal Sexual Conduct 1st or 2nd degree, Criminal Sexual Conduct with a Minor (or Attempted) 1st or 2nd degree, Criminal Sexual Conduct with a Minor 3rd degree-Commit/Attempt Lewd Act (victim under 16 years and actor over 14 years) Drugs - Manufacture, Distribution or Etc. of Methamphetamine 1st, 2nd, 3rd, or Subsequent Offenses, Drug Trafficking (44-53-0370, 44-53-0375), Engaging a Child for Sexual Performance, Homicide by Child Abuse (or Aiding or Abetting), Kidnapping, Murder, Robbery (Armed, Attempted Armed), Taking of Hostages by an Inmate, Voluntary Manslaughter, or Accessory Before the Fact to any of the above crimes.

Table 4-A and Figure 2 describe all active offenders by level of supervision on June 30, 2012. This total does not include indirect supervision offenders, such as those incarcerated on split sentences. The level of supervision determines how often the offender is seen by the Agent. Among all offenders, high level supervision represented 18% and standard supervision represented 76%. Sex offender supervision and intensive supervision each represented 3% of all active offenders.

Table 5-A shows total closures by type (successful or unsuccessful). Closures include only those offenders in which all cases have completely closed out from SCDPPPS. Only the last order to close during FY 2012 and within that order only the main case, even though an offender may have had more than one case, is included. The overall success rate for all offenders closing during FY 2012 was 71%, an increase of 4% from last fiscal year. The unsuccessful rate, 29%, is defined as those offenders whose supervision was revoked due to a technical violation or new offense and those instances when the offender was sentenced to prison on a new offense.

Table 6-A describes offender admissions by age category.

Note: Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

TABLE 1-A							
TOTAL ADMISSIONS BY PROGRAM TYPE							
COUNTY	PROBATION	PERCENT PROBATION	PAROLE	PERCENT PAROLE	YOA	PERCENT YOA	TOTAL
ABBEVILLE	75	90%	5	6%	3	4%	83
AIKEN	378	77%	72	15%	40	8%	490
ALLENDALE	32	70%	2	4%	12	26%	46
ANDERSON	519	84%	69	11%	30	5%	618
BAMBERG	28	61%	9	20%	9	20%	46
BARNWELL	51	73%	10	14%	9	13%	70
BEAUFORT	258	85%	22	7%	22	7%	302
BERKELEY	431	82%	42	8%	51	10%	524
CALHOUN	51	82%	6	10%	5	8%	62
CHARLESTON	1,190	85%	124	9%	80	6%	1,394
CHEROKEE	354	92%	30	8%	2	1%	386
CHESTER	122	80%	19	13%	11	7%	152
CHESTERFIELD	65	67%	19	20%	13	13%	97
CLARENDON	122	83%	18	12%	7	5%	147
COLLETON	146	80%	15	8%	21	12%	182
DARLINGTON	151	72%	29	14%	29	14%	209
DILLON	106	82%	9	7%	15	12%	130
DORCHESTER	279	81%	28	8%	38	11%	345
EDGEFIELD	122	87%	10	7%	9	6%	141
FAIRFIELD	86	86%	11	11%	3	3%	100
FLORENCE	582	82%	78	11%	50	7%	710
GEORGETOWN	188	78%	36	15%	17	7%	241
GREENVILLE	1,858	91%	126	6%	49	2%	2,033
GREENWOOD	261	83%	33	10%	21	7%	315
HAMPTON	61	79%	9	12%	7	9%	77
HORRY	591	77%	137	18%	40	5%	768
JASPER	129	82%	14	9%	15	9%	158
KERSHAW	111	85%	15	11%	5	4%	131
LANCASTER	231	88%	19	7%	12	5%	262
LAURENS	248	87%	28	10%	8	3%	284
LEE	72	79%	10	11%	9	10%	91
LEXINGTON	618	83%	81	11%	46	6%	745
McCORMICK	20	71%	7	25%	1	4%	28
MARION	150	81%	24	13%	12	6%	186
MARLBORO	82	78%	14	13%	9	9%	105
NEWBERRY	163	87%	13	7%	11	6%	187
OCONEE	167	86%	17	9%	10	5%	194
ORANGEBURG	388	86%	41	9%	22	5%	451
PICKENS	453	91%	30	6%	16	3%	499
RICHLAND	788	73%	213	20%	82	8%	1,083
SALUDA	50	82%	4	7%	7	11%	61
SPARTANBURG	1,564	89%	130	7%	61	3%	1,755
SUMTER	363	79%	57	12%	37	8%	457
UNION	156	85%	19	10%	8	4%	183
WILLIAMSBURG	134	83%	17	11%	10	6%	161
YORK	751	84%	108	12%	40	4%	899
TRANSITIONAL	2	3%	51	69%	21	28%	74
STATE TOTAL	14,747	83%	1,880	11%	1,035	6%	17,662


TABLE 2-A
TOTAL ADMISSIONS BY TYPE OF OFFENSE

COUNTY	OMNIBUS VIOLENT	PERCENT VIOLENT	NONVIOLENT	PERCENT NONVIOLENT	TOTAL ADMISSIONS
ABBEVILLE	6	7%	77	93%	83
AIKEN	67	14%	423	86%	490
ALLENDALE	1	2%	45	98%	46
ANDERSON	88	14%	530	86%	618
BAMBERG	3	7%	43	93%	46
BARNWELL	4	6%	66	94%	70
BEAUFORT	14	5%	288	95%	302
BERKELEY	31	6%	493	94%	524
CALHOUN	3	5%	59	95%	62
CHARLESTON	83	6%	1,311	94%	1,394
CHEROKEE	21	5%	365	95%	386
CHESTER	21	14%	131	86%	152
CHESTERFIELD	14	14%	83	86%	97
CLARENDON	8	5%	139	95%	147
COLLETON	10	5%	172	95%	182
DARLINGTON	20	10%	189	90%	209
DILLON	7	5%	123	95%	130
DORCHESTER	29	8%	316	92%	345
EDGEFIELD	9	6%	132	94%	141
FAIRFIELD	5	5%	95	95%	100
FLORENCE	53	7%	657	93%	710
GEORGETOWN	14	6%	227	94%	241
GREENVILLE	114	6%	1,919	94%	2,033
GREENWOOD	25	8%	290	92%	315
HAMPTON	6	8%	71	92%	77
HORRY	59	8%	709	92%	768
JASPER	7	4%	151	96%	158
KERSHAW	15	11%	116	89%	131
LANCASTER	17	6%	245	94%	262
LAURENS	18	6%	266	94%	284
LEE	8	9%	83	91%	91
LEXINGTON	73	10%	672	90%	745
McCORMICK	7	25%	21	75%	28
MARION	14	8%	172	92%	186
MARLBORO	3	3%	102	97%	105
NEWBERRY	12	6%	175	94%	187
OCONEE	24	12%	170	88%	194
ORANGEBURG	28	6%	423	94%	451
PICKENS	50	10%	449	90%	499
RICHLAND	157	14%	926	86%	1,083
SALUDA	5	8%	56	92%	61
SPARTANBURG	159	9%	1,596	91%	1,755
SUMTER	37	8%	420	92%	457
UNION	12	7%	171	93%	183
WILLIAMSBURG	15	9%	146	91%	161
YORK	78	9%	821	91%	899
TRANSITIONAL	31	42%	43	58%	74
STATE TOTAL	1,485	8%	16,177	92%	17,662

TABLE 3-A
TOTAL ADMISSIONS BY GENDER AND RACE
N=17,662

COUNTY	PERCENT MALE	PERCENT FEMALE	PERCENT BLACK	PERCENT OTHER	PERCENT WHITE
ABBEVILLE	82%	18%	43%	0%	57%
AIKEN	80%	20%	44%	0%	56%
ALLENDALE	98%	2%	89%	0%	11%
ANDERSON	77%	23%	38%	0%	62%
BAMBERG	93%	7%	70%	0%	30%
BARNWELL	87%	13%	50%	0%	50%
BEAUFORT	83%	17%	55%	3%	42%
BERKELEY	87%	13%	49%	2%	49%
CALHOUN	90%	10%	68%	2%	31%
CHARLESTON	87%	13%	69%	1%	31%
CHEROKEE	77%	23%	33%	1%	66%
CHESTER	85%	15%	51%	1%	48%
CHESTERFIELD	92%	8%	64%	1%	35%
CLARENDON	82%	18%	80%	0%	20%
COLLETON	82%	18%	62%	1%	38%
DARLINGTON	80%	20%	61%	0%	39%
DILLON	85%	15%	62%	8%	30%
DORCHESTER	81%	19%	53%	1%	46%
EDGEFIELD	80%	20%	55%	3%	43%
FAIRFIELD	82%	18%	76%	0%	24%
FLORENCE	81%	19%	66%	1%	33%
GEORGETOWN	78%	22%	63%	1%	35%
GREENVILLE	77%	23%	45%	3%	52%
GREENWOOD	82%	18%	66%	1%	33%
HAMPTON	94%	6%	78%	0%	22%
HORRY	80%	20%	36%	2%	62%
JASPER	84%	16%	74%	1%	25%
KERSHAW	82%	18%	40%	2%	58%
LANCASTER	83%	17%	55%	2%	44%
LAURENS	80%	20%	34%	3%	63%
LEE	77%	23%	90%	0%	10%
LEXINGTON	81%	19%	38%	2%	61%
McCORMICK	79%	21%	61%	0%	39%
MARION	83%	17%	73%	2%	25%
MARLBORO	74%	26%	62%	10%	29%
NEWBERRY	83%	17%	64%	4%	32%
OCONEE	73%	27%	19%	2%	79%
ORANGEBURG	84%	16%	78%	0%	22%
PICKENS	74%	26%	15%	1%	84%
RICHLAND	85%	15%	78%	1%	21%
SALUDA	72%	28%	49%	7%	44%
SPARTANBURG	78%	22%	45%	2%	52%
SUMTER	83%	17%	72%	0%	28%
UNION	79%	21%	45%	0%	55%
WILLIAMSBURG	86%	14%	76%	1%	23%
YORK	80%	20%	43%	2%	55%
TRANSITIONAL	88%	12%	54%	1%	45%
STATE TOTAL	81%	19%	53%	2%	46%

FIGURE 1
TOTAL ADMISSIONS BY GENDER AND RACE
FY 2012



WHITE MALES

BLACK MALES

OTHER MALES

WHITE FEMALES


BLACK FEMALES

OTHER FEMALES

TABLE 4-A
ACTIVE OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION

COUNTY	STANDARD	HIGH	INTENSIVE	SEX OFFENDER	TOTAL
ABBEVILLE	77%	18%	1%	4%	158
AIKEN	78%	15%	3%	5%	1,127
ALLENDALE	79%	18%	2%	1%	96
ANDERSON	72%	22%	2%	4%	1,597
BAMBERG	84%	10%	5%	1%	147
BARNWELL	84%	10%	4%	2%	199
BEAUFORT	73%	20%	3%	3%	444
BERKELEY	75%	19%	2%	3%	909
CALHOUN	84%	9%	6%	2%	104
CHARLESTON	74%	21%	3%	2%	2,888
CHEROKEE	71%	24%	3%	2%	654
CHESTER	77%	19%	4%	1%	269
CHESTERFIELD	75%	16%	4%	4%	161
CLARENDON	79%	13%	5%	4%	257
COLLETON	77%	15%	4%	3%	466
DARLINGTON	74%	20%	4%	3%	314
DILLON	84%	8%	4%	4%	160
DORCHESTER	79%	15%	3%	3%	867
EDGEFIELD	77%	19%	2%	2%	244
FAIRFIELD	73%	24%	1%	2%	199
FLORENCE	76%	17%	4%	4%	1,041
GEORGETOWN	80%	16%	2%	2%	411
GREENVILLE	76%	20%	2%	2%	3,975
GREENWOOD	67%	25%	5%	2%	583
HAMPTON	86%	11%	1%	1%	169
HORRY	81%	12%	3%	4%	1,412
JASPER	74%	20%	2%	4%	226
KERSHAW	76%	18%	2%	4%	298
LANCASTER	72%	23%	3%	2%	541
LAURENS	80%	15%	2%	3%	513
LEE	76%	21%	2%	1%	126
LEXINGTON	74%	19%	5%	3%	1,355
McCORMICK	78%	13%	4%	5%	99
MARION	72%	22%	5%	2%	199
MARLBORO	67%	26%	6%	2%	126
NEWBERRY	71%	22%	4%	2%	328
OCONEE	75%	17%	1%	7%	398
ORANGEBURG	90%	7%	2%	2%	838
PICKENS	72%	23%	2%	3%	956
RICHLAND	81%	13%	4%	3%	2,486
SALUDA	64%	24%	6%	6%	84
SPARTANBURG	70%	24%	4%	2%	2,618
SUMTER	80%	13%	4%	3%	767
UNION	79%	16%	3%	2%	338
WILLIAMSBURG	68%	21%	5%	6%	316
YORK	77%	17%	3%	3%	1,208
TRANSITIONAL	----	----	----	----	0
STATE TOTAL	76%	18%	3%	3%	
ACTIVE OFFENDERS	24,822	5,954	970	925	32,671

FIGURE 2
ACTIVE OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION
JUNE 30, 2012



CONTACT STANDARDS

STANDARD	HIGH	INTENSIVE
1 Face-to-Face/Quarter	1 Progress Report Every Other Month Following the initial Home Visit, additional Home Visits will be conducted in the event of community complaints and violation investigation	2 Progress Reports/Month 1 Home Visit Every Other Month

**TABLE 5-A
TOTAL CLOSURES BY TYPE**

COUNTY	SUCCESSFUL	SUCCESSFUL RATE	UNSUCCESSFUL	UNSUCCESSFUL RATE
ABBEVILLE	65	67%	32	33%
AIKEN	307	70%	130	30%
ALLENDALE	17	50%	17	50%
ANDERSON	493	79%	134	21%
BAMBERG	29	71%	12	29%
BARNWELL	35	58%	25	42%
BEAUFORT	244	79%	64	21%
BERKELEY	376	78%	106	22%
CALHOUN	36	72%	14	28%
CHARLESTON	1,009	81%	233	19%
CHEROKEE	139	65%	75	35%
CHESTER	89	72%	34	28%
CHESTERFIELD	80	76%	25	24%
CLARENDON	66	57%	50	43%
COLLETON	128	72%	50	28%
DARLINGTON	161	73%	61	27%
DILLON	63	72%	24	28%
DORCHESTER	234	76%	72	24%
EDGEFIELD	62	72%	24	28%
FAIRFIELD	73	68%	35	32%
FLORENCE	385	68%	179	32%
GEORGETOWN	149	73%	56	27%
GREENVILLE	872	64%	482	36%
GREENWOOD	225	79%	61	21%
HAMPTON	42	82%	9	18%
HORRY	500	69%	224	31%
JASPER	55	66%	28	34%
KERSHAW	89	78%	25	22%
LANCASTER	190	69%	86	31%
LAURENS	250	69%	110	31%
LEE	38	54%	32	46%
LEXINGTON	460	71%	188	29%
MCCORMICK	16	59%	11	41%
MARION	101	75%	33	25%
MARLBORO	49	64%	27	36%
NEWBERRY	109	69%	50	31%
OCONEE	148	70%	64	30%
ORANGEBURG	300	76%	94	24%
PICKENS	248	68%	116	32%
RICHLAND	711	65%	391	35%
SALUDA	38	75%	13	25%
SPARTANBURG	650	67%	326	33%
SUMTER	258	64%	148	36%
UNION	139	74%	50	26%
WILLIAMSBURG	113	74%	39	26%
YORK	477	70%	208	30%
TRANSITIONAL	331	100%	1	0%
STATE TOTAL	10,649	71%	4,268	29%

**TABLE 6-A
TOTAL ADMISSIONS BY AGE**

COUNTY	Age 24 & Under	Percent 24 & Under	Age 25 & Over	Percent 25 & Over
ABBEVILLE	20	24%	63	76%
AIKEN	137	28%	353	72%
ALLENDALE	17	37%	29	63%
ANDERSON	142	23%	476	77%
BAMBERG	13	28%	33	72%
BARNWELL	23	33%	47	67%
BEAUFORT	118	39%	184	61%
BERKELEY	164	31%	360	69%
CALHOUN	25	40%	37	60%
CHARLESTON	402	29%	992	71%
CHEROKEE	89	23%	297	77%
CHESTER	44	29%	108	71%
CHESTERFIELD	32	33%	65	67%
CLARENDON	37	25%	110	75%
COLLETON	67	37%	115	63%
DARLINGTON	80	38%	129	62%
DILLON	51	39%	79	61%
DORCHESTER	116	34%	229	66%
EDGEFIELD	32	23%	109	77%
FAIRFIELD	41	41%	59	59%
FLORENCE	233	33%	477	67%
GEORGETOWN	81	34%	160	66%
GREENVILLE	482	24%	1551	76%
GREENWOOD	111	35%	204	65%
HAMPTON	26	34%	51	66%
HORRY	225	29%	543	71%
JASPER	44	28%	114	72%
KERSHAW	30	23%	101	77%
LANCASTER	73	28%	189	72%
LAURENS	69	24%	215	76%
LEE	34	37%	57	63%
LEXINGTON	220	30%	525	70%
McCORMICK	5	18%	23	82%
MARION	53	28%	133	72%
MARLBORO	36	34%	69	66%
NEWBERRY	60	32%	127	68%
OCONEE	42	22%	152	78%
ORANGEBURG	137	30%	314	70%
PICKENS	131	26%	368	74%
RICHLAND	360	33%	723	67%
SALUDA	14	23%	47	77%
SPARTANBURG	437	25%	1318	75%
SUMTER	150	33%	307	67%
UNION	58	32%	125	68%
WILLIAMSBURG	52	32%	109	68%
YORK	327	36%	572	64%
TRANSITIONAL	21	28%	53	72%
STATE TOTAL	5,161	29%	12,501	71%

SECTION B

PROBATION

FISCAL YEAR 2012

PROBATION

The Department is charged with the responsibility of supervising those offenders placed on probation by the Court. Probation is a court-ordered community sanction which suspends the imposition of all or part of the original sentence of incarceration. It requires the offender, under SCDPPPS supervision in the community, to adhere to a set of conditions which limit the offender's freedom, reparation to victims if so ordered, and to provide for judicial revocation for violation of those conditions.

Tables 1-B and 2-B represent all probation admissions during FY 2012. Probation includes Probation, PTUP (Probation Terminated Upon Payment), Split Probation admitted to probation with a split sentence from prison, Monitor for the Court, and NGRI (Not Guilt by Reason of Insanity).

Table 1-B shows probation admissions in terms of offense type, violent or non-violent. For FY 2012, 4% of all probation admissions were for violent offenses.

Table 2-B provides information on probation admissions by gender and race. Probation admissions were predominately male, at 78%, with a racial composition of 50% black, 2% other, and 48% white.

Table 3-B and Figure 3 describe the active probation offender population in terms of level of supervision on June 30, 2012. These figures do not include indirect supervision offenders, such as those incarcerated on split sentences, Absconders, offenders transferred out of state and others who are not under the day-to-day supervision of the Department. Among probationers, those on high level supervision represented 19% of the population, standard supervision represented 78%, intensive supervision at 1% followed by sex offender supervision representing 2% of probationers.

Table 4-B provides data for probation closures by type (successful or unsuccessful). The overall success rate for probationers was 70%, slightly lower than the total offender population success rate of 71%.

Table 5-B reflects probation admissions by age category.

TABLE 1-B
PROBATION ADMISSIONS BY TYPE OF OFFENSE

COUNTY	OMNIBUS VIOLENT	PERCENT VIOLENT	NONVIOLENT	PERCENT NONVIOLENT	TOTAL ADMISSIONS
ABBEVILLE	3	4%	72	96%	75
AIKEN	37	10%	341	90%	378
ALLENDALE	0	0%	32	100%	32
ANDERSON	36	7%	483	93%	519
BAMBERG	1	4%	27	96%	28
BARNWELL	2	4%	49	96%	51
BEAUFORT	5	2%	253	98%	258
BERKELEY	8	2%	423	98%	431
CALHOUN	0	0%	51	100%	51
CHARLESTON	18	2%	1,172	98%	1,190
CHEROKEE	10	3%	344	97%	354
CHESTER	5	4%	117	96%	122
CHESTERFIELD	4	6%	61	94%	65
CLARENDON	1	1%	121	99%	122
COLLETON	4	3%	142	97%	146
DARLINGTON	9	6%	142	94%	151
DILLON	1	1%	105	99%	106
DORCHESTER	13	5%	266	95%	279
EDGEFIELD	5	4%	117	96%	122
FAIRFIELD	1	1%	85	99%	86
FLORENCE	14	2%	568	98%	582
GEORGETOWN	3	2%	185	98%	188
GREENVILLE	65	3%	1,793	97%	1,858
GREENWOOD	15	6%	246	94%	261
HAMPTON	2	3%	59	97%	61
HORRY	11	2%	580	98%	591
JASPER	1	1%	128	99%	129
KERSHAW	4	4%	107	96%	111
LANCASTER	4	2%	227	98%	231
LAURENS	10	4%	238	96%	248
LEE	1	1%	71	99%	72
LEXINGTON	36	6%	582	94%	618
McCORMICK	2	10%	18	90%	20
MARION	2	1%	148	99%	150
MARLBORO	0	0%	82	100%	82
NEWBERRY	2	1%	161	99%	163
OCONEE	14	8%	153	92%	167
ORANGEBURG	8	2%	380	98%	388
PICKENS	37	8%	416	92%	453
RICHLAND	42	5%	746	95%	788
SALUDA	2	4%	48	96%	50
SPARTANBURG	84	5%	1,480	95%	1,564
SUMTER	3	1%	360	99%	363
UNION	5	3%	151	97%	156
WILLIAMSBURG	6	4%	128	96%	134
YORK	33	4%	718	96%	751
TRANSITIONAL	0	0%	2	100%	2
STATE TOTAL	569	4%	14,178	96%	14,747


TABLE 2-B
PROBATION ADMISSIONS BY GENDER AND RACE

COUNTY	PERCENT MALE	PERCENT FEMALE	PERCENT BLACK	PERCENT OTHER	PERCENT WHITE
ABBEVILLE	81%	19%	43%	0%	57%
AIKEN	76%	24%	39%	0%	60%
ALLENDALE	97%	3%	88%	0%	13%
ANDERSON	74%	26%	35%	0%	65%
BAMBERG	89%	11%	57%	0%	43%
BARNWELL	84%	16%	51%	0%	49%
BEAUFORT	81%	19%	54%	3%	43%
BERKELEY	84%	16%	47%	1%	52%
CALHOUN	88%	12%	69%	0%	31%
CHARLESTON	85%	15%	65%	1%	34%
CHEROKEE	75%	25%	32%	1%	68%
CHESTER	83%	17%	50%	0%	50%
CHESTERFIELD	91%	9%	62%	2%	37%
CLARENDON	80%	20%	79%	0%	21%
COLLETON	78%	22%	55%	1%	45%
DARLINGTON	75%	25%	52%	0%	48%
DILLON	82%	18%	60%	9%	30%
DORCHESTER	79%	21%	51%	1%	48%
EDGEFIELD	80%	20%	57%	2%	40%
FAIRFIELD	80%	20%	77%	0%	23%
FLORENCE	79%	21%	62%	1%	37%
GEORGETOWN	73%	27%	61%	1%	38%
GREENVILLE	75%	25%	43%	3%	54%
GREENWOOD	79%	21%	62%	2%	36%
HAMPTON	93%	7%	75%	0%	25%
HORRY	76%	24%	32%	2%	66%
JASPER	82%	18%	71%	1%	28%
KERSHAW	79%	21%	39%	2%	59%
LANCASTER	81%	19%	51%	2%	47%
LAURENS	77%	23%	30%	3%	67%
LEE	74%	26%	88%	0%	13%
LEXINGTON	79%	21%	35%	2%	63%
McCORMICK	80%	20%	50%	0%	50%
MARION	79%	21%	70%	2%	28%
MARLBORO	72%	28%	57%	10%	33%
NEWBERRY	80%	20%	62%	4%	34%
OCONEE	70%	30%	16%	1%	84%
ORANGEBURG	82%	18%	76%	0%	23%
PICKENS	72%	28%	15%	2%	84%
RICHLAND	82%	18%	77%	1%	22%
SALUDA	68%	32%	46%	2%	52%
SPARTANBURG	76%	24%	44%	2%	53%
SUMTER	80%	20%	70%	0%	30%
UNION	76%	24%	42%	0%	58%
WILLIAMSBURG	86%	14%	74%	1%	25%
YORK	78%	22%	40%	2%	58%
TRANSITIONAL	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%
STATE TOTAL	78%	22%	50%	2%	48%

TABLE 3-B
ACTIVE PROBATION OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION

COUNTY	STANDARD	HIGH	INTENSIVE	SEX OFFENDER	TOTAL
ABBEVILLE	74%	21%	1%	4%	136
AIKEN	79%	16%	1%	5%	921
ALLENDALE	83%	14%	1%	1%	72
ANDERSON	74%	22%	1%	3%	1,423
BAMBERG	87%	10%	3%	0%	117
BARNWELL	87%	11%	1%	1%	156
BEAUFORT	76%	20%	0%	3%	378
BERKELEY	77%	19%	1%	3%	768
CALHOUN	84%	10%	4%	2%	93
CHARLESTON	76%	21%	1%	2%	2,458
CHEROKEE	71%	26%	2%	2%	591
CHESTER	80%	19%	0%	0%	215
CHESTERFIELD	82%	16%	1%	2%	128
CLARENDON	82%	14%	2%	2%	219
COLLETON	80%	16%	1%	3%	399
DARLINGTON	77%	19%	0%	3%	243
DILLON	87%	10%	0%	3%	115
DORCHESTER	82%	15%	1%	2%	722
EDGEFIELD	78%	20%	0%	2%	225
FAIRFIELD	72%	26%	0%	2%	177
FLORENCE	80%	17%	0%	2%	857
GEORGETOWN	83%	15%	0%	2%	323
GREENVILLE	77%	20%	1%	2%	3,635
GREENWOOD	69%	28%	1%	2%	486
HAMPTON	87%	12%	0%	1%	135
HORRY	83%	12%	1%	4%	1,135
JASPER	75%	21%	1%	3%	182
KERSHAW	77%	19%	1%	3%	245
LANCASTER	73%	24%	1%	2%	483
LAURENS	80%	16%	0%	3%	446
LEE	78%	22%	0%	0%	99
LEXINGTON	76%	20%	2%	2%	1,141
McCORMICK	78%	15%	2%	5%	81
MARION	75%	22%	2%	1%	155
MARLBORO	74%	24%	0%	2%	97
NEWBERRY	73%	23%	2%	2%	282
OCONEE	75%	17%	0%	7%	355
ORANGEBURG	91%	7%	0%	2%	681
PICKENS	72%	24%	1%	3%	881
RICHLAND	84%	13%	1%	3%	1,964
SALUDA	65%	23%	6%	7%	71
SPARTANBURG	72%	24%	2%	2%	2,353
SUMTER	85%	12%	1%	2%	627
UNION	80%	17%	1%	2%	295
WILLIAMSBURG	71%	23%	0%	6%	252
YORK	79%	18%	1%	3%	1,007
TRANSITIONAL	----	----	----	----	0
STATE TOTAL	78%	19%	1%	2%	
ACTIVE	21,594	5,247	296	687	27,824

FIGURE 3
ACTIVE PROBATION OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION
JUNE 30, 2012



PROBATION CLOSURES BY TYPE

TABLE 4-B

COUNTY	SUCCESSFUL	SUCCESSFUL RATE	UNSUCCESSFUL	UNSUCCESSFUL RATE
ABBEVILLE	47	59%	32	41%
AIKEN	247	68%	115	32%
ALLENDALE	12	52%	11	48%
ANDERSON	425	78%	119	22%
BAMBERG	22	67%	11	33%
BARNWELL	26	57%	20	43%
BEAUFORT	204	81%	48	19%
BERKELEY	315	80%	78	20%
CALHOUN	32	73%	12	27%
CHARLESTON	813	81%	186	19%
CHEROKEE	117	64%	67	36%
CHESTER	71	72%	27	28%
CHESTERFIELD	61	79%	16	21%
CLARENDON	51	55%	41	45%
COLLETON	112	71%	46	29%
DARLINGTON	125	72%	48	28%
DILLON	42	70%	18	30%
DORCHESTER	203	81%	49	19%
EDGEFIELD	57	74%	20	26%
FAIRFIELD	62	69%	28	31%
FLORENCE	299	68%	143	32%
GEORGETOWN	111	71%	45	29%
GREENVILLE	742	63%	429	37%
GREENWOOD	195	77%	58	23%
HAMPTON	34	83%	7	17%
HORRY	394	67%	193	33%
JASPER	38	62%	23	38%
KERSHAW	77	79%	21	21%
LANCASTER	155	67%	75	33%
LAURENS	218	70%	93	30%
LEE	32	52%	30	48%
LEXINGTON	394	70%	167	30%
MCCORMICK	15	60%	10	40%
MARION	73	74%	25	26%
MARLBORO	33	56%	26	44%
NEWBERRY	91	67%	44	33%
OCONEE	125	69%	56	31%
ORANGEBURG	242	76%	77	24%
PICKENS	229	68%	108	32%
RICHLAND	526	62%	323	38%
SALUDA	26	67%	13	33%
SPARTANBURG	521	65%	280	35%
SUMTER	185	60%	121	40%
UNION	122	73%	44	27%
WILLIAMSBURG	83	72%	32	28%
YORK	380	67%	183	33%
TRANSITIONAL	230	100%	1	0%
STATE TOTAL	8,614	70%	3,619	30%

**TABLE 5-B
PROBATION ADMISSIONS BY AGE**

COUNTY	Age 24 & Under	Percent 24 & Under	Age 25 & Over	Percent 25 & Over
ABBEVILLE	18	24%	57	76%
AIKEN	99	26%	279	74%
ALLENDALE	9	28%	23	72%
ANDERSON	109	21%	410	79%
BAMBERG	4	14%	24	86%
BARNWELL	11	22%	40	78%
BEAUFORT	98	38%	160	62%
BERKELEY	123	29%	308	71%
CALHOUN	20	39%	31	61%
CHARLESTON	323	27%	867	73%
CHEROKEE	83	23%	271	77%
CHESTER	34	28%	88	72%
CHESTERFIELD	19	29%	46	71%
CLARENDON	30	25%	92	75%
COLLETON	46	32%	100	68%
DARLINGTON	51	34%	100	66%
DILLON	38	36%	68	64%
DORCHESTER	82	29%	197	71%
EDGEFIELD	22	18%	100	82%
FAIRFIELD	38	44%	48	56%
FLORENCE	178	31%	404	69%
GEORGETOWN	63	34%	125	66%
GREENVILLE	437	24%	1421	76%
GREENWOOD	91	35%	170	65%
HAMPTON	20	33%	41	67%
HORRY	173	29%	418	71%
JASPER	32	25%	97	75%
KERSHAW	26	23%	85	77%
LANCASTER	61	26%	170	74%
LAURENS	57	23%	191	77%
LEE	25	35%	47	65%
LEXINGTON	165	27%	453	73%
McCORMICK	4	20%	16	80%
MARION	40	27%	110	73%
MARLBORO	27	33%	55	67%
NEWBERRY	49	30%	114	70%
OCONEE	32	19%	135	81%
ORANGEBURG	113	29%	275	71%
PICKENS	113	25%	340	75%
RICHLAND	257	33%	531	67%
SALUDA	8	16%	42	84%
SPARTANBURG	370	24%	1194	76%
SUMTER	116	32%	247	68%
UNION	48	31%	108	69%
WILLIAMSBURG	43	32%	91	68%
YORK	280	37%	471	63%
TRANSITIONAL	0	0%	2	100%
STATE TOTAL	4,085	28%	10,662	72%

SECTION C

PAROLE

FISCAL YEAR 2012

PAROLE

The Department is charged with the responsibility of supervising those offenders paroled by the South Carolina Board of Pardons and Paroles. Parole is the conditional release of an individual from imprisonment, but not from the legal custody of the state, to complete his/her sentence outside a correctional institution under conditions and provisions of supervision determined by the Board. Should an individual be granted parole, he/she must agree to abide by certain conditions of community supervision. The violation of any of these conditions is sufficient grounds for revocation of parole by the Board, and the imposition of the remainder of the original sentence of incarceration. The parole category also includes DJJ early release and Community Supervision Program offenders

Table 1-C shows parole admissions by type of offense. A larger percent of parole admissions, 48%, fall into the violent category, as compared to 4% for probation admissions (see Table 1-B) and 2% for YOA (see Table 1-D) admissions.

Table 2-C describes all parole admissions by gender and race. Parole admissions consisted primarily of males, 92%, with a racial composition of 65% black, 2% other, and 33% white.

Table 3-C and Figure 4 describe active parolees by level of supervision on June 30, 2012. These figures do not include indirect supervision offenders, such as absconders, offenders transferred out of state and others who are not under the day-to-day supervision of the Department. Among parolees, standard supervision offenders represented 65% of the parolee population, followed by high level at 14%. Intensive supervision accounted for 13% of the parolee population and sex offender supervision was 7%.

Table 4-C presents parole case closures by type (successful or unsuccessful). The overall success rate for parolees (91%) was higher than that of probationers (70%, See Table 4-B).

Table 5-C describes the parole population by age category.

TABLE 1-C
PAROLE ADMISSIONS BY TYPE OF OFFENSE

COUNTY	OMNIBUS VIOLENT	PERCENT VIOLENT	NONVIOLENT	PERCENT NONVIOLENT	TOTAL ADMISSIONS
ABBEVILLE	3	60%	2	40%	5
AIKEN	26	36%	46	64%	72
ALLENDALE	1	50%	1	50%	2
ANDERSON	48	70%	21	30%	69
BAMBERG	2	22%	7	78%	9
BARNWELL	2	20%	8	80%	10
BEAUFORT	8	36%	14	64%	22
BERKELEY	23	55%	19	45%	42
CALHOUN	3	50%	3	50%	6
CHARLESTON	64	52%	60	48%	124
CHEROKEE	11	37%	19	63%	30
CHESTER	15	79%	4	21%	19
CHESTERFIELD	10	53%	9	47%	19
CLARENDON	7	39%	11	61%	18
COLLETON	6	40%	9	60%	15
DARLINGTON	11	38%	18	62%	29
DILLON	6	67%	3	33%	9
DORCHESTER	15	54%	13	46%	28
EDGEFIELD	2	20%	8	80%	10
FAIRFIELD	4	36%	7	64%	11
FLORENCE	38	49%	40	51%	78
GEORGETOWN	11	31%	25	69%	36
GREENVILLE	49	39%	77	61%	126
GREENWOOD	10	30%	23	70%	33
HAMPTON	3	33%	6	67%	9
HORRY	48	35%	89	65%	137
JASPER	5	36%	9	64%	14
KERSHAW	11	73%	4	27%	15
LANCASTER	13	68%	6	32%	19
LAURENS	8	29%	20	71%	28
LEE	7	70%	3	30%	10
LEXINGTON	37	46%	44	54%	81
McCORMICK	5	71%	2	29%	7
MARION	12	50%	12	50%	24
MARLBORO	3	21%	11	79%	14
NEWBERRY	10	77%	3	23%	13
OCONEE	10	59%	7	41%	17
ORANGEBURG	20	49%	21	51%	41
PICKENS	12	40%	18	60%	30
RICHLAND	114	54%	99	46%	213
SALUDA	3	75%	1	25%	4
SPARTANBURG	73	56%	57	44%	130
SUMTER	33	58%	24	42%	57
UNION	7	37%	12	63%	19
WILLIAMSBURG	9	53%	8	47%	17
YORK	45	42%	63	58%	108
TRANSITIONAL	31	61%	20	39%	51
STATE TOTAL	894	48%	986	52%	1,880


TABLE 2-C
PAROLE ADMISSIONS BY GENDER AND RACE

COUNTY	PERCENT MALE	PERCENT FEMALE	PERCENT BLACK	PERCENT OTHER	PERCENT WHITE
ABBEVILLE	80%	20%	20%	0%	80%
AIKEN	89%	11%	57%	0%	43%
ALLENDALE	100%	0%	50%	0%	50%
ANDERSON	93%	7%	48%	1%	51%
BAMBERG	100%	0%	78%	0%	22%
BARNWELL	90%	10%	40%	0%	60%
BEAUFORT	95%	5%	55%	0%	45%
BERKELEY	98%	2%	50%	5%	45%
CALHOUN	100%	0%	67%	17%	17%
CHARLESTON	95%	5%	88%	0%	12%
CHEROKEE	90%	10%	53%	0%	47%
CHESTER	95%	5%	47%	5%	47%
CHESTERFIELD	89%	11%	68%	0%	32%
CLARENDON	89%	11%	83%	0%	17%
COLLETON	100%	0%	87%	0%	13%
DARLINGTON	86%	14%	90%	0%	10%
DILLON	100%	0%	67%	0%	33%
DORCHESTER	82%	18%	54%	0%	46%
EDGEFIELD	80%	20%	30%	10%	60%
FAIRFIELD	91%	9%	73%	0%	27%
FLORENCE	95%	5%	86%	1%	13%
GEORGETOWN	92%	8%	69%	3%	28%
GREENVILLE	93%	7%	59%	5%	37%
GREENWOOD	94%	6%	85%	0%	15%
HAMPTON	89%	11%	89%	0%	11%
HORRY	91%	9%	48%	1%	51%
JASPER	86%	14%	86%	0%	14%
KERSHAW	100%	0%	40%	0%	60%
LANCASTER	100%	0%	79%	0%	21%
LAURENS	100%	0%	57%	0%	43%
LEE	80%	20%	100%	0%	0%
LEXINGTON	93%	7%	49%	2%	48%
McCORMICK	71%	29%	86%	0%	14%
MARION	96%	4%	83%	4%	13%
MARLBORO	79%	21%	86%	0%	14%
NEWBERRY	100%	0%	77%	0%	23%
OCONEE	88%	12%	41%	12%	47%
ORANGEBURG	93%	7%	85%	0%	15%
PICKENS	93%	7%	17%	0%	83%
RICHLAND	92%	8%	83%	1%	16%
SALUDA	75%	25%	25%	75%	0%
SPARTANBURG	91%	9%	45%	5%	50%
SUMTER	91%	9%	82%	2%	16%
UNION	100%	0%	68%	0%	32%
WILLIAMSBURG	88%	12%	88%	0%	12%
YORK	93%	7%	65%	3%	32%
TRANSITIONAL	86%	14%	57%	2%	41%
STATE TOTAL	92%	8%	65%	2%	33%

TABLE 3-C
ACTIVE PAROLE OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION

COUNTY	STANDARD	HIGH	INTENSIVE	SEX OFFENDER	TOTAL
ABBEVILLE	86%	7%	0%	7%	14
AIKEN	73%	11%	9%	7%	115
ALLENDALE	100%	0%	0%	0%	7
ANDERSON	60%	17%	13%	10%	109
BAMBERG	62%	8%	15%	15%	13
BARNWELL	71%	5%	19%	5%	21
BEAUFORT	61%	24%	16%	0%	38
BERKELEY	60%	22%	7%	10%	68
CALHOUN	80%	0%	20%	0%	5
CHARLESTON	55%	25%	12%	7%	177
CHEROKEE	69%	10%	19%	2%	42
CHESTER	71%	14%	11%	3%	35
CHESTERFIELD	50%	18%	9%	23%	22
CLARENDON	57%	7%	18%	18%	28
COLLETON	54%	13%	17%	17%	24
DARLINGTON	76%	15%	5%	5%	41
DILLON	71%	10%	5%	14%	21
DORCHESTER	64%	15%	6%	15%	47
EDGEFIELD	56%	22%	22%	0%	9
FAIRFIELD	80%	13%	7%	0%	15
FLORENCE	57%	16%	13%	14%	113
GEORGETOWN	65%	21%	8%	6%	48
GREENVILLE	71%	13%	10%	6%	252
GREENWOOD	62%	12%	17%	10%	60
HAMPTON	70%	20%	0%	10%	10
HORRY	68%	13%	13%	6%	182
JASPER	71%	17%	4%	8%	24
KERSHAW	71%	12%	5%	12%	41
LANCASTER	76%	8%	8%	8%	38
LAURENS	70%	10%	13%	8%	40
LEE	76%	18%	0%	6%	17
LEXINGTON	58%	15%	21%	7%	130
McCORMICK	67%	8%	17%	8%	12
MARION	60%	23%	10%	7%	30
MARLBORO	45%	25%	30%	0%	20
NEWBERRY	71%	13%	13%	3%	31
OCONEE	73%	5%	0%	23%	22
ORANGEBURG	76%	8%	10%	6%	72
PICKENS	75%	15%	4%	6%	48
RICHLAND	68%	12%	14%	6%	340
SALUDA	67%	33%	0%	0%	6
SPARTANBURG	63%	14%	16%	7%	186
SUMTER	56%	18%	19%	7%	73
UNION	58%	15%	27%	0%	26
WILLIAMSBURG	52%	19%	17%	12%	42
YORK	70%	11%	14%	5%	132
TRANSITIONAL	----	----	----	----	0
STATE TOTAL	65%	14%	13%	7%	
ACTIVE	1,863	410	360	213	2,846

FIGURE 4
ACTIVE PAROLE OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION
JUNE 30, 2012



PAROLE CLOSURES BY TYPE

TABLE 4-C

COUNTY	SUCCESSFUL	SUCCESSFUL	UNSUCCESSFUL	UNSUCCESSFUL
ABBEVILLE	16	100%	0	0%
AIKEN	45	88%	6	12%
ALLENDALE	1	100%	0	0%
ANDERSON	50	98%	1	2%
BAMBERG	5	100%	0	0%
BARNWELL	5	100%	0	0%
BEAUFORT	16	84%	3	16%
BERKELEY	23	96%	1	4%
CALHOUN	4	80%	1	20%
CHARLESTON	104	95%	6	5%
CHEROKEE	13	100%	0	0%
CHESTER	11	85%	2	15%
CHESTERFIELD	15	88%	2	12%
CLARENDON	10	91%	1	9%
COLLETON	3	100%	0	0%
DARLINGTON	23	92%	2	8%
DILLON	10	77%	3	23%
DORCHESTER	10	67%	5	33%
EDGEFIELD	4	80%	1	20%
FAIRFIELD	7	70%	3	30%
FLORENCE	51	94%	3	6%
GEORGETOWN	31	94%	2	6%
GREENVILLE	87	85%	15	15%
GREENWOOD	21	95%	1	5%
HAMPTON	3	100%	0	0%
HORRY	73	94%	5	6%
JASPER	9	90%	1	10%
KERSHAW	8	100%	0	0%
LANCASTER	25	96%	1	4%
LAURENS	27	90%	3	10%
LEE	4	80%	1	20%
LEXINGTON	54	90%	6	10%
MCCORMICK	1	100%	0	0%
MARION	17	85%	3	15%
MARLBORO	8	89%	1	11%
NEWBERRY	14	100%	0	0%
OCONEE	15	88%	2	12%
ORANGEBURG	39	95%	2	5%
PICKENS	15	75%	5	25%
RICHLAND	135	86%	22	14%
SALUDA	11	100%	0	0%
SPARTANBURG	106	92%	9	8%
SUMTER	51	96%	2	4%
UNION	11	85%	2	15%
WILLIAMSBURG	21	100%	0	0%
YORK	72	94%	5	6%
TRANSITIONAL	85	100%	0	0%
STATE TOTAL	1,369	91%	128	9%

**TABLE 5-C
PAROLE ADMISSIONS BY AGE**

COUNTY	Age 24 & Under	Percent 24 & Under	Age 25 & Over	Percent 25 & Over
ABBEVILLE	0	0%	5	100%
AIKEN	6	8%	66	92%
ALLENDALE	1	50%	1	50%
ANDERSON	8	12%	61	88%
BAMBERG	1	11%	8	89%
BARNWELL	3	30%	7	70%
BEAUFORT	0	0%	22	100%
BERKELEY	3	7%	39	93%
CALHOUN	0	0%	6	100%
CHARLESTON	14	11%	110	89%
CHEROKEE	5	17%	25	83%
CHESTER	1	5%	18	95%
CHESTERFIELD	2	11%	17	89%
CLARENDON	1	6%	17	94%
COLLETON	2	13%	13	87%
DARLINGTON	4	14%	25	86%
DILLON	1	11%	8	89%
DORCHESTER	2	7%	26	93%
EDGEFIELD	1	10%	9	90%
FAIRFIELD	1	9%	10	91%
FLORENCE	9	12%	69	88%
GEORGETOWN	2	6%	34	94%
GREENVILLE	7	6%	119	94%
GREENWOOD	1	3%	32	97%
HAMPTON	1	11%	8	89%
HORRY	18	13%	119	87%
JASPER	1	7%	13	93%
KERSHAW	0	0%	15	100%
LANCASTER	2	11%	17	89%
LAURENS	5	18%	23	82%
LEE	3	30%	7	70%
LEXINGTON	13	16%	68	84%
McCORMICK	0	0%	7	100%
MARION	3	13%	21	88%
MARLBORO	1	7%	13	93%
NEWBERRY	1	8%	12	92%
OCONEE	1	6%	16	94%
ORANGEBURG	6	15%	35	85%
PICKENS	4	13%	26	87%
RICHLAND	32	15%	181	85%
SALUDA	0	0%	4	100%
SPARTANBURG	14	11%	116	89%
SUMTER	6	11%	51	89%
UNION	4	21%	15	79%
WILLIAMSBURG	0	0%	17	100%
YORK	13	12%	95	88%
TRANSITIONAL	4	8%	47	92%
STATE TOTAL	207	11%	1,673	89%

SECTION D

YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS

FISCAL YEAR 2012

YOUTHFUL OFFENDER RELEASE

Inmates ages 17 through 24, sentenced under the South Carolina Youthful Offender Act (YOA) to an indeterminate period of incarceration, not to exceed six years, within the South Carolina Department of Corrections (SCDC), may be conditionally released prior to that time, based on offense category, adjustment, and evaluation while incarcerated.

Table 1-D displays YOA admissions by type of offense. YOA violent admissions of 2% is less than for those admitted to probation at 4% (See Table 1-B).

Table 2-D illustrates YOA admissions by gender and race. Admissions were predominately male (96%) and black (71%).

Table 3-D and Figure 5 describe the active population for YOA conditional release offenders in terms of level of supervision on June 30, 2012. Fifteen percent (15%) were supervised at a high level. Intensive level supervision accounted for 16%, while 68% were supervised at standard level and 1% at the sex offender level.

Table 4-D shows YOA offenders are more inclined to close unsuccessfully (44%) than the parole population (9%, see Table 4-C) or the probation population (30%, See Table 4-B).

Table 5-D describes YOA admissions by age category.

TABLE 1-D
YOA ADMISSIONS BY TYPE OF OFFENSE

COUNTY	OMNIBUS VIOLENT	PERCENT VIOLENT	NONVIOLENT	PERCENT NONVIOLENT	TOTAL ADMISSIONS
ABBEVILLE	0	0%	3	100%	3
AIKEN	4	10%	36	90%	40
ALLENDALE	0	0%	12	100%	12
ANDERSON	4	13%	26	87%	30
BAMBERG	0	0%	9	100%	9
BARNWELL	0	0%	9	100%	9
BEAUFORT	1	5%	21	95%	22
BERKELEY	0	0%	51	100%	51
CALHOUN	0	0%	5	100%	5
CHARLESTON	1	1%	79	99%	80
CHEROKEE	0	0%	2	100%	2
CHESTER	1	9%	10	91%	11
CHESTERFIELD	0	0%	13	100%	13
CLARENDON	0	0%	7	100%	7
COLLETON	0	0%	21	100%	21
DARLINGTON	0	0%	29	100%	29
DILLON	0	0%	15	100%	15
DORCHESTER	1	3%	37	97%	38
EDGEFIELD	2	22%	7	78%	9
FAIRFIELD	0	0%	3	100%	3
FLORENCE	1	2%	49	98%	50
GEORGETOWN	0	0%	17	100%	17
GREENVILLE	0	0%	49	100%	49
GREENWOOD	0	0%	21	100%	21
HAMPTON	1	14%	6	86%	7
HORRY	0	0%	40	100%	40
JASPER	1	7%	14	93%	15
KERSHAW	0	0%	5	100%	5
LANCASTER	0	0%	12	100%	12
LAURENS	0	0%	8	100%	8
LEE	0	0%	9	100%	9
LEXINGTON	0	0%	46	100%	46
McCORMICK	0	0%	1	100%	1
MARION	0	0%	12	100%	12
MARLBORO	0	0%	9	100%	9
NEWBERRY	0	0%	11	100%	11
OCONEE	0	0%	10	100%	10
ORANGEBURG	0	0%	22	100%	22
PICKENS	1	6%	15	94%	16
RICHLAND	1	1%	81	99%	82
SALUDA	0	0%	7	100%	7
SPARTANBURG	2	3%	59	97%	61
SUMTER	1	3%	36	97%	37
UNION	0	0%	8	100%	8
WILLIAMSBURG	0	0%	10	100%	10
YORK	0	0%	40	100%	40
TRANSITIONAL	0	0%	21	100%	21
STATE TOTAL	22	2%	1,013	98%	1,035


TABLE 2-D
YOA ADMISSIONS BY GENDER AND RACE

COUNTY	PERCENT MALE	PERCENT FEMALE	PERCENT BLACK	PERCENT OTHER	PERCENT WHITE
ABBEVILLE	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
AIKEN	98%	3%	60%	3%	38%
ALLENDALE	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
ANDERSON	97%	3%	63%	0%	37%
BAMBERG	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
BARNWELL	100%	0%	56%	0%	44%
BEAUFORT	95%	5%	64%	9%	27%
BERKELEY	98%	2%	65%	4%	31%
CALHOUN	100%	0%	60%	0%	40%
CHARLESTON	98%	3%	91%	0%	9%
CHEROKEE	100%	0%	50%	0%	50%
CHESTER	91%	9%	73%	0%	27%
CHESTERFIELD	100%	0%	69%	0%	31%
CLARENDON	100%	0%	86%	0%	14%
COLLETON	100%	0%	90%	0%	10%
DARLINGTON	100%	0%	83%	0%	17%
DILLON	100%	0%	73%	0%	27%
DORCHESTER	92%	8%	68%	0%	32%
EDGEFIELD	78%	22%	44%	0%	56%
FAIRFIELD	100%	0%	67%	0%	33%
FLORENCE	94%	6%	82%	0%	18%
GEORGETOWN	100%	0%	82%	0%	18%
GREENVILLE	94%	6%	59%	2%	39%
GREENWOOD	95%	5%	86%	0%	14%
HAMPTON	100%	0%	86%	0%	14%
HORRY	100%	0%	50%	0%	50%
JASPER	100%	0%	87%	0%	13%
KERSHAW	100%	0%	80%	0%	20%
LANCASTER	100%	0%	92%	0%	8%
LAURENS	100%	0%	63%	0%	38%
LEE	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
LEXINGTON	87%	13%	48%	0%	52%
McCORMICK	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%
MARION	100%	0%	92%	0%	8%
MARLBORO	89%	11%	67%	22%	11%
NEWBERRY	100%	0%	73%	9%	18%
OCONEE	100%	0%	40%	0%	60%
ORANGEBURG	100%	0%	86%	0%	14%
PICKENS	88%	13%	6%	0%	94%
RICHLAND	88%	12%	84%	0%	16%
SALUDA	100%	0%	86%	0%	14%
SPARTANBURG	97%	3%	69%	2%	30%
SUMTER	97%	3%	76%	0%	24%
UNION	100%	0%	50%	0%	50%
WILLIAMSBURG	90%	10%	90%	0%	10%
YORK	95%	5%	43%	0%	58%
TRANSITIONAL	90%	10%	52%	0%	48%
STATE TOTAL	96%	4%	71%	1%	28%

TABLE 3-D
ACTIVE YOA OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION

COUNTY	STANDARD	HIGH	INTENSIVE	SEX OFFENDER	TOTAL
ABBEVILLE	100%	0%	0%	0%	8
AIKEN	73%	11%	15%	1%	91
ALLENDALE	53%	41%	6%	0%	17
ANDERSON	66%	14%	18%	2%	65
BAMBERG	82%	6%	12%	0%	17
BARNWELL	82%	5%	9%	5%	22
BEAUFORT	50%	14%	32%	4%	28
BERKELEY	70%	19%	8%	3%	73
CALHOUN	83%	0%	17%	0%	6
CHARLESTON	71%	18%	10%	1%	253
CHEROKEE	86%	5%	0%	10%	21
CHESTER	47%	26%	26%	0%	19
CHESTERFIELD	45%	18%	36%	0%	11
CLARENDON	70%	10%	20%	0%	10
COLLETON	63%	12%	23%	2%	43
DARLINGTON	40%	30%	30%	0%	30
DILLON	79%	0%	21%	0%	24
DORCHESTER	71%	15%	11%	2%	98
EDGEFIELD	70%	0%	30%	0%	10
FAIRFIELD	86%	0%	14%	0%	7
FLORENCE	62%	10%	27%	1%	71
GEORGETOWN	68%	18%	15%	0%	40
GREENVILLE	74%	13%	14%	0%	88
GREENWOOD	49%	16%	35%	0%	37
HAMPTON	88%	4%	8%	0%	24
HORRY	75%	9%	12%	4%	95
JASPER	75%	15%	10%	0%	20
KERSHAW	83%	8%	8%	0%	12
LANCASTER	40%	35%	20%	5%	20
LAURENS	85%	11%	4%	0%	27
LEE	60%	20%	20%	0%	10
LEXINGTON	65%	13%	19%	2%	84
McCORMICK	100%	0%	0%	0%	6
MARION	64%	14%	21%	0%	14
MARLBORO	33%	56%	11%	0%	9
NEWBERRY	40%	27%	33%	0%	15
OCONEE	71%	19%	10%	0%	21
ORANGEBURG	92%	2%	6%	0%	85
PICKENS	56%	22%	19%	4%	27
RICHLAND	71%	13%	16%	0%	182
SALUDA	57%	29%	14%	0%	7
SPARTANBURG	38%	38%	23%	1%	79
SUMTER	57%	19%	22%	1%	67
UNION	88%	6%	0%	6%	17
WILLIAMSBURG	59%	9%	32%	0%	22
YORK	75%	7%	17%	0%	69
STATE TOTAL	68%	15%	16%	1%	
ACTIVE	1,365	297	314	25	2,001

FIGURE 5
ACTIVE YOA OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION
JUNE 30, 2012



**TABLE 4-D
YOA CLOSURES BY TYPE**

COUNTY	SUCCESSFUL	SUCCESSFUL RATE	UNSUCCESSFUL	UNSUCCESSFUL RATE
ABBEVILLE	2	100%	0	0%
AIKEN	15	63%	9	38%
ALLENDALE	4	40%	6	60%
ANDERSON	18	56%	14	44%
BAMBERG	2	67%	1	33%
BARNWELL	4	44%	5	56%
BEAUFORT	24	65%	13	35%
BERKELEY	38	58%	27	42%
CALHOUN	0	0%	1	100%
CHARLESTON	92	69%	41	31%
CHEROKEE	9	53%	8	47%
CHESTER	7	58%	5	42%
CHESTERFIELD	4	36%	7	64%
CLARENDON	5	38%	8	62%
COLLETON	13	76%	4	24%
DARLINGTON	13	54%	11	46%
DILLON	11	79%	3	21%
DORCHESTER	21	54%	18	46%
EDGEFIELD	1	25%	3	75%
FAIRFIELD	4	50%	4	50%
FLORENCE	35	51%	33	49%
GEORGETOWN	7	44%	9	56%
GREENVILLE	43	53%	38	47%
GREENWOOD	9	82%	2	18%
HAMPTON	5	71%	2	29%
HORRY	33	56%	26	44%
JASPER	8	67%	4	33%
KERSHAW	4	50%	4	50%
LANCASTER	10	50%	10	50%
LAURENS	5	26%	14	74%
LEE	2	67%	1	33%
LEXINGTON	12	44%	15	56%
MCCORMICK	0	0%	1	100%
MARION	11	69%	5	31%
MARLBORO	8	100%	0	0%
NEWBERRY	4	40%	6	60%
OCONEE	8	57%	6	43%
ORANGEBURG	19	56%	15	44%
PICKENS	4	57%	3	43%
RICHLAND	50	52%	46	48%
SALUDA	1	100%	0	0%
SPARTANBURG	23	38%	37	62%
SUMTER	22	47%	25	53%
UNION	6	60%	4	40%
WILLIAMSBURG	9	56%	7	44%
YORK	25	56%	20	44%
TRANSITIONAL	16	100%	0	0%
STATE TOTAL	666	56%	521	44%

TABLE 5-D
YOA ADMISSIONS BY AGE

COUNTY	Age 24 & Under	Percent 24 & Under	Age 25 & Over	Percent 25 & Over
ABBEVILLE	2	67%	1	33%
AIKEN	32	80%	8	20%
ALLENDALE	7	58%	5	42%
ANDERSON	25	83%	5	17%
BAMBERG	8	89%	1	11%
BARNWELL	9	100%	0	0%
BEAUFORT	20	91%	2	9%
BERKELEY	38	75%	13	25%
CALHOUN	5	100%	0	0%
CHARLESTON	65	81%	15	19%
CHEROKEE	1	50%	1	50%
CHESTER	9	82%	2	18%
CHESTERFIELD	11	85%	2	15%
CLARENDON	6	86%	1	14%
COLLETON	19	90%	2	10%
DARLINGTON	25	86%	4	14%
DILLON	12	80%	3	20%
DORCHESTER	32	84%	6	16%
EDGEFIELD	9	100%	0	0%
FAIRFIELD	2	67%	1	33%
FLORENCE	46	92%	4	8%
GEORGETOWN	16	94%	1	6%
GREENVILLE	38	78%	11	22%
GREENWOOD	19	90%	2	10%
HAMPTON	5	71%	2	29%
HORRY	34	85%	6	15%
JASPER	11	73%	4	27%
KERSHAW	4	80%	1	20%
LANCASTER	10	83%	2	17%
LAURENS	7	88%	1	13%
LEE	6	67%	3	33%
LEXINGTON	42	91%	4	9%
McCORMICK	1	100%	0	0%
MARION	10	83%	2	17%
MARLBORO	8	89%	1	11%
NEWBERRY	10	91%	1	9%
OCONEE	9	90%	1	10%
ORANGEBURG	18	82%	4	18%
PICKENS	14	88%	2	13%
RICHLAND	71	87%	11	13%
SALUDA	6	86%	1	14%
SPARTANBURG	53	87%	8	13%
SUMTER	28	76%	9	24%
UNION	6	75%	2	25%
WILLIAMSBURG	9	90%	1	10%
YORK	34	85%	6	15%
TRANSITIONAL	17	81%	4	19%
STATE TOTAL	869	84%	166	16%

SECTION E

SEX OFFENDERS

FISCAL YEAR 2012

SEX OFFENDERS

The Department is responsible for supervising those offenders sentenced to community supervision by the Court of General Sessions or released from incarceration on other supervision programs who have been convicted of sex offenses.

In Table 1-E and Figure 6, those offenders who have been convicted of a sex offense are shown. SCDPPPS utilizes the Sex Offender Management Program to supervise those sex offenders who are currently serving an active sentence for a sex offense. For those offenders currently under supervision for an offense that is not a sex offense but who are required to register as a sex offender for a previous offense, SCDPPPS provides general supervision according to the offender's risk assessment score.


There are three levels of sex offender supervision: SO-Containment, SO-Intensive, and SO-High. A male sex offender's level of supervision is determined by his score on the Static-99 risk assessment. Female sex offenders are supervised at the SO-High level of supervision for the duration of their supervision period.

SEX OFFENDER CONTACT STANDARDS		
SO-HIGH	SO-INTENSIVE	SO-CONTAINMENT
1 Home Visit Every Other Month 1 Employment Verification/Month 1 Office Visit/Month 1 Treatment Provider Contact/Month 1 Computer Search Every Six Month, if Applicable	1 Home Visits/Month 1 Employment Verification/Month 1 Office Visit/Month 1 Treatment Provider Contact/Month 1 Computer Search Every Other Month, if Applicable	2 Home Visits/Month 1 Employment Verification/Month 1 Office Visit/Month 1 Treatment Provider Contact/Month 1 Computer Search/Month, if Applicable

TABLE 1-E
ACTIVE SEX OFFENDERS UNDER SUPERVISION

COUNTY	SEX OFFENDER MANAGEMENT SUPERVISION		GENERAL SUPERVISION		TOTAL SEX OFFENDERS
ABBEVILLE	6	60%	4	40%	10
AIKEN	52	84%	10	16%	62
ALLENDALE	1	50%	1	50%	2
ANDERSON	57	70%	24	30%	81
BAMBERG	2	33%	4	67%	6
BARNWELL	4	57%	3	43%	7
BEAUFORT	14	93%	1	7%	15
BERKELEY	30	79%	8	21%	38
CALHOUN	2	33%	4	67%	6
CHARLESTON	62	64%	35	36%	97
CHEROKEE	14	67%	7	33%	21
CHESTER	2	40%	3	60%	5
CHESTERFIELD	7	64%	4	36%	11
CLARENDON	9	56%	7	44%	16
COLLETON	16	80%	4	20%	20
DARLINGTON	9	82%	2	18%	11
DILLON	7	78%	2	22%	9
DORCHESTER	24	71%	10	29%	34
EDGEFIELD	4	50%	4	50%	8
FAIRFIELD	3	100%	0	0%	3
FLORENCE	37	82%	8	18%	45
GEORGETOWN	9	100%	0	0%	9
GREENVILLE	84	78%	24	22%	108
GREENWOOD	14	70%	6	30%	20
HAMPTON	2	50%	2	50%	4
HORRY	58	85%	10	15%	68
JASPER	8	73%	3	27%	11
KERSHAW	13	87%	2	13%	15
LANCASTER	12	71%	5	29%	17
LAURENS	16	80%	4	20%	20
LEE	1	100%	0	0%	1
LEXINGTON	35	83%	7	17%	42
McCORMICK	5	71%	2	29%	7
MARION	3	75%	1	25%	4
MARLBORO	2	50%	2	50%	4
NEWBERRY	8	40%	12	60%	20
OCONEE	29	88%	4	12%	33
ORANGEBURG	15	75%	5	25%	20
PICKENS	28	72%	11	28%	39
RICHLAND	72	77%	22	23%	94
SALUDA	5	71%	2	29%	7
SPARTANBURG	64	75%	21	25%	85
SUMTER	21	78%	6	22%	27
UNION	6	60%	4	40%	10
WILLIAMSBURG	19	83%	4	17%	23
YORK	34	72%	13	28%	47
STATE TOTAL	925	74%	317	26%	1,242

FIGURE 5
ACTIVE YOA OFFENDERS BY LEVEL OF SUPERVISION
JUNE 30, 2012



SECTION F

VIOLATIONS

FISCAL YEAR 2012

VIOLATIONS

Offenders charged by their supervising Agents with violations of the conditions of supervision are reviewed through an administrative hearing process to determine if probable cause of a violation exists. If a violation is found, a determination is made as to which community sanctions should be imposed, or whether the case should be referred to the Board or the Court for revocation action.

Table 1-F provides data by county on the violation process. Statewide, a total of 3,645 violation hearings were held. At those hearings, 2,391 cases were continued or recommended for continuation, while 1,254 cases were revoked or recommended for revocation.

Table 2-F provides a comparison of changes in active population and the types of closure for FY 2008 to FY 2012.

**TABLE 1-F
VIOLATIONS BY COUNTY**

COUNTY	Cases Heard	Cases Continued or Recommended for Continuation	Cases Revoked or Recommended for Revocation
Abbeville	2	2	0
Aiken	117	79	38
Allendale	25	8	17
Anderson	357	318	39
Bamberg	29	20	9
Barnwell	29	21	8
Beaufort	29	13	16
Berkeley	127	78	49
Calhoun	43	27	16
Charleston	425	257	168
Cherokee	74	51	23
Chester	9	3	6
Chesterfield	10	2	8
Clarendon	44	28	16
Colleton	24	11	13
Darlington	23	11	12
Dillon	21	10	11
Dorchester	82	49	33
Edgefield	42	38	4
Fairfield	6	2	4
Florence	87	57	30
Georgetown	14	4	10
Greenville	720	548	172
Greenwood	36	31	5
Hampton	24	6	18
Horry	53	31	22
Jasper	18	11	7
Kershaw	15	7	8
Lancaster	47	31	16
Laurens	33	14	19
Lee	4	3	1
Lexington	88	63	25
Marion	24	16	8
Marlboro	7	2	5
McCormick	7	5	2
Newberry	28	15	13
Oconee	95	63	32
Orangeburg	166	80	86
Pickens	35	16	19
Richland	229	127	102
Saluda	10	7	3
Spartanburg	163	94	69
Sumter	103	58	45
Union	44	32	12
Williamsburg	14	8	6
York	63	34	29
STATE TOTAL	3,645	2,391	1,254

**TABLE 2-F
CLOSURES BY TYPE**

FY 2012	Active Population	Successful	Exp-I¹	JC-I²	Rev-C³	Rev-T⁴	Rev-TC⁵	Total Unsuccessful
Probation	27,824	8,614	16	12	703	2,888	0	3,619
Parole	1,626	516	10	0	11	60	0	81
YOA	2,001	666	12	0	136	373	0	521
Other Releases	1,220	853	46	0	0	1	0	47
Total	32,671	10,649	84	12	850	3,322	0	4,268
% Unsuccessful⁶			1.6%	0.2%	16.6%	65.0%	0.0%	

FY 2011	Active Population	Successful	Exp-I¹	JC-I²	Rev-C³	Rev-T⁴	Rev-TC⁵	Total Unsuccessful
Probation	25,902	8,431	27	6	446	3,719	239	4,437
Parole	1,728	409	6	0	8	37	8	59
YOA	2,222	539	9	0	54	385	70	518
Other Releases	1,125	1,063	93	0	0	0	0	93
Total	30,977	10,442	135	6	508	4,141	317	5,107
% Unsuccessful⁶			2.6%	0.1%	9.9%	81.1%	6.2%	

FY 2010	Active Population	Successful	Exp-I¹	JC-I²	Rev-C³	Rev-T⁴	Rev-TC⁵	Total Unsuccessful
Probation	26,157	9,109	28	6	485	4,142	255	4,916
Parole	1,587	435	9	0	9	70	14	102
YOA	2,096	542	14	0	62	570	55	701
Other Releases	1,422	648	110	0	0	1	0	111
Total	31,262	10,734	161	6	556	4,783	324	5,830
% Unsuccessful⁶			2.8%	0.1%	9.5%	82.0%	5.6%	

FY 2009	Active Population	Successful	Exp-I¹	JC-I²	Rev-C³	Rev-T⁴	Rev-TC⁵	Total Unsuccessful
Probation	26,694	10,092	29	6	446	4,494	207	5,182
Parole	1,653	577	7	0	14	117	7	145
YOA	2,053	550	14	0	44	614	34	706
Other Releases	1,297	645	220	0	0	0	0	220
Total	31,697	11,864	270	6	504	5,225	248	6,253
% Unsuccessful⁶			4.3%	0.1%	8.1%	83.6%	4.0%	

FY 2008	Active Population	Successful	Exp-I¹	JC-I²	Rev-C³	Rev-T⁴	Rev-TC⁵	Total Unsuccessful
Probation	26,990	9,547	44	19	404	4,313	213	4,993
Parole	1,911	657	13	0	14	147	10	184
YOA	1,921	539	13	0	52	583	27	675
Other Releases	1,372	552	23	0	0	6	0	29
Total	32,194	11,295	93	19	470	5,049	250	5,881
% Unsuccessful⁶			1.6%	0.3%	8.0%	85.9%	4.3%	

Footnotes:

- 1 Exp-I - Expired Offender in Institution
- 2 JC-I - Judicial Closure in Institution
- 3 Rev-C - Revoke, New Conviction

- 4 Rev-T - Revoke, Technical Charges
- 5 Rev TC - Revoke, Technical Charges & New Charges Pending
- 6 Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.

SECTION G

ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE

FISCAL YEAR 2012

ELECTRONIC SURVEILLANCE

The Department utilizes electronic surveillance to monitor certain offenders. Home detention is a special condition of intensive supervision. Offenders are confined to their residences except for those times authorized by the Court, Parole Board or supervising probation/parole Agent. Electronic Monitoring (EM) is the enhanced surveillance technique used in conjunction with home detention to ensure heightened supervision and accountability for those offenders on intensive supervision status. It is used to verify the degree of the offender's compliance with the conditions of Home Detention. At the end of FY 2012, 171 offenders were on EM.

On June 8, 2006, Jessie's Law, a bill aimed at protecting our state's children through tougher penalties for sex predators was signed into law with an effective date of July 1, 2006. Named after Jessica Marie Lunsford -- who was murdered in 2005 by a registered sex offender in Florida -- the law imposes a mandatory minimum of 25 years in prison for sex predators and mandates Global Positioning Satellite (GPS) monitoring for sex offenders convicted of certain offenses. GPS can pinpoint within 15 meters a person's position on Earth using 24 satellites in orbit at 11,000 nautical miles above the Earth. The satellites are owned and operated by the Department of Defense and continuously transmit signals which can be detected by anyone possessing a GPS receiver. Figure 7 shows the number of offenders on EM and Figure 8 shows the GPS population each month of the fiscal year.

FIGURE 7
ACTIVE OFFENDERS ON ELECTRONIC MONITORING
FISCAL YEAR 2012





FIGURE 8
ACTIVE OFFENDERS ON GPS
FISCAL YEAR 2012



SECTION H

SUMMARY

FISCAL YEAR 2012

SUMMARY

Table 1-H shows offender referrals during the fiscal year.

Abbreviations:

AA/NA	ALCOHOLICS ANONOMOUS/NARCOTICS ANONOMOUS
DNA	DEOXYRIBONUCLEIC ACID BLOOD TESTING
DRGTST	DRUG TESTING
DSS	SC DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES
DVC	DOMESTIC VIOLENCE COUSELING
ED	HIGH SCHOOL EQUIVALENCY PROGRAMS
ESC	EMPLOYMENT SECURITY COMMISSION (WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT)
MH	METAL HEALTH COUNSELING/TREATMENT
PEP	PAROLE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM
PSE	PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT
RE EN	REENTRY INITIATIVES
SAC	SUBSTANCE ABUSE COUNSELING
SOC	SEX OFFENDER COUNSELING/TREATMENT
SPICE	SELF-PACED IN CLASS EDUCATION
VR	SC DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Table 2-H shows DNA collections by county and Figure 9 illustrates monthly collections.

Table 3-H shows drug testing activity during FY 2012. This table represents the number of individual offenders tested, the number of individuals testing positive, the total number of positive tests and the number of times offenders were tested.

Table 4-H summarizes the population characteristics of SCDPPPS offenders by supervision programs as well as offender involvement in drug testing.

The proportion of violent offenses among YOA admissions (2%) and probationers (4%) remained the same when comparing FY 2011 and FY 2012. The percentage of violent offenses among parole admissions increased by 5% over the previous year.

Overall, the most utilized level of supervision was standard (78%), followed by high (19%), intensive (1%) and sex offender (2%) for all cases.

The overall success rate for closures was 71% during the fiscal year. The overall success rate for parolees was 91%. Both probationers (70%) and YOA offenders (56%) had less successful closures rates than parolees, but each showed an increase in successful closures over the previous fiscal year.

Of the 19,052 offenders tested for drug use while under supervision, 8,293 or 43.5%, tested positive for drugs.

Figure 10 compares the number of admissions for each fiscal year from 1993 to 2012. Admissions increased for FY 2012 by 4.7% from the previous fiscal year.

Figure 11 displays the percentage of violent admissions by program for fiscal years 2003 to 2012.

**TABLE 1-H
OFFENDER REFERRALS AS OF JUNE 30, 2012**

COUNTY	AA/NA	DNA	DSS	DVC	ESC	ED *	MH	PEP	PSE	ReEn	SAC	SOC	SPICE	VR	Total
ABBEVILLE	0	0	1	1	0	3	2	0	12	0	20	0	0	4	46
AIKEN	3	113	0	5	0	14	18	1	110	0	218	13	0	7	516
ALLENDALE	0	14	0	2	0	18	0	0	10	0	27	0	0	24	113
ANDERSON	39	74	19	36	0	30	26	2	84	0	267	15	2	52	676
BAMBERG	0	1	0	1	0	0	3	0	12	0	16	0	1	1	35
BARNWELL	0	9	0	0	0	1	4	1	19	0	40	0	1	2	78
BEAUFORT	0	41	0	9	0	10	3	0	50	0	74	3	1	31	232
BERKELEY	2	3	0	7	0	12	9	0	56	0	69	11	0	7	188
CALHOUN	2	0	0	4	0	2	0	0	7	0	13	0	0	23	53
CHARLESTON	2	22	3	27	1	66	24	3	173	4	378	22	2	28	821
CHEROKEE	1	5	1	15	0	44	10	2	78	0	124	2	0	9	335
CHESTER	0	51	0	6	0	6	2	0	36	0	66	1	0	3	177
CHESTERFIELD	4	10	0	3	0	3	5	0	61	0	21	3	0	12	125
CLARENDON	0	2	2	3	0	4	2	0	19	0	20	4	0	4	64
COLLETON	0	0	0	1	0	9	2	0	3	0	21	3	0	0	48
DARLINGTON	2	20	1	3	0	12	4	0	34	0	32	5	0	9	134
DILLON	1	3	0	4	0	3	1	0	3	0	7	0	0	0	25
DORCHESTER	1	1	0	2	0	5	2	0	26	0	39	3	0	1	85
EDGEFIELD	4	18	0	2	0	5	4	0	18	0	32	0	0	12	100
FAIRFIELD	1	36	0	4	2	3	3	0	21	0	24	2	0	24	123
FLORENCE	9	69	0	25	4	17	18	2	206	0	213	15	2	33	630
GEORGETOWN	6	57	0	4	86	13	13	1	20	0	97	4	1	10	325
GREENVILLE	10	36	21	59	0	127	64	1	220	0	860	18	3	32	1,578
GREENWOOD	2	7	0	13	0	13	3	0	24	0	53	5	1	21	155
HAMPTON	1	1	0	3	0	1	0	0	2	0	6	1	0	0	16
HORRY	10	23	3	14	5	25	12	1	44	2	185	4	2	26	381
JASPER	3	8	0	3	2	10	7	0	23	0	47	2	0	15	130
KERSHAW	0	4	0	3	0	4	6	1	5	0	25	6	0	7	65
LANCASTER	1	74	0	10	10	10	14	0	75	0	118	2	0	28	352
LAURENS	4	1	2	13	0	17	6	0	54	0	115	8	0	26	263
LEE	1	4	0	2	0	12	3	0	12	0	6	0	0	10	62
LEXINGTON	3	226	3	15	0	20	29	1	114	0	269	19	0	45	764
McCORMICK	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	2	4	0	8	1	0	2	20
MARION	0	50	0	12	3	0	4	1	33	0	48	3	0	12	166
MARLBORO	0	14	0	1	0	8	6	0	11	0	10	0	0	9	67
NEWBERRY	0	2	1	5	0	1	1	0	9	0	13	1	0	44	78
OCONEE	2	33	6	4	0	8	3	0	19	0	78	3	0	7	171
ORANGEBURG	1	7	0	5	0	5	5	0	20	0	23	2	0	10	83
PICKENS	1	0	3	14	0	33	16	2	33	0	209	3	0	6	353
RICHLAND	18	209	2	7	0	41	34	6	179	1	270	20	3	65	896
SALUDA	1	3	0	1	0	2	5	0	8	0	36	2	0	22	82
SPARTANBURG	12	7	7	31	0	195	57	7	362	0	521	16	1	73	1,484
SUMTER	3	32	0	3	0	15	3	0	20	0	67	0	0	22	180
UNION	0	32	0	5	0	11	9	0	15	0	46	5	0	6	140
WILLIAMSBURG	0	6	0	6	1	1	4	1	7	0	16	3	0	7	53
YORK	20	270	3	2	0	34	20	6	72	0	264	14	3	21	763
TRANSITIONAL	0	43	1	3	1	11	11	0	33	0	89	7	0	6	216
						0									
STATE TOTAL	170	1,642	79	400	115	884	477	41	2,456	7	5,200	251	23	818	13,447


*ED is comprised of referrals to all educational programs, including Adult Education, GED, and Learn & Earn.

TABLE 2-H	
DNA COLLECTIONS AS OF JUNE 30, 2012	
COUNTY	TOTAL COLLECTIONS
ABBEVILLE	17
AIKEN	190
ALLENDALE	16
ANDERSON	208
BAMBERG	23
BARNWELL	22
BEAUFORT	118
BERKELEY	211
CALHOUN	29
CHARLESTON	316
CHEROKEE	94
CHESTER	59
CHESTERFIELD	56
CLARENDON	50
COLLETON	69
DARLINGTON	93
DILLON	49
DORCHESTER	125
EDGEFIELD	51
FAIRFIELD	44
FLORENCE	314
GEORGETOWN	76
GREENVILLE	576
GREENWOOD	124
HAMPTON	22
HORRY	328
JASPER	42
KERSHAW	43
LANCASTER	94
LAURENS	91
LEE	23
LEXINGTON	235
McCORMICK	1
MARION	69
MARLBORO	55
NEWBERRY	52
OCONEE	78
ORANGEBURG	151
PICKENS	167
RICHLAND	374
SALUDA	19
SPARTANBURG	512
SUMTER	178
UNION	51
WILLIAMSBURG	47
YORK	275
STATE TOTAL	5,837

FIGURE 9

MONTHLY DNA COLLECTIONS – FISCAL YEAR 2012

TOTAL = 5,837



**TABLE 3-H
OFFENDER DRUG TESTING**

COUNTY	INDIVIDUAL OFFENDER S TESTED	INDIVIDUALS TESTING POSITIVE	PERCENTAGE OF INDIVIDUAL OFFENDERS TESTING POSITIVE	TOTAL NO. POSITIVE TESTS	NUMBER OF TIMES OFFENDERS WERE TESTED
ABBEVILLE	73	29	39.73%	72	102
AIKEN	544	120	22.06%	204	697
ALLENDALE	74	46	62.16%	95	92
ANDERSON	871	433	49.71%	827	1,034
BAMBERG	75	45	60.00%	97	104
BARNWELL	84	39	46.43%	112	131
BEAUFORT	386	147	38.08%	218	468
BERKELEY	703	178	25.32%	250	786
CALHOUN	131	68	51.91%	150	277
CHARLESTON	1,373	697	50.76%	997	1,497
CHEROKEE	423	215	50.83%	426	485
CHESTER	191	81	42.41%	139	253
CHESTERFIEL	160	65	40.63%	135	261
CLARENDON	107	22	20.56%	22	111
COLLETON	148	61	41.22%	82	169
DARLINGTON	288	146	50.69%	266	370
DILLON	47	6	12.77%	8	54
DORCHESTER	196	88	44.90%	132	225
EDGEFIELD	240	102	42.50%	164	309
FAIRFIELD	158	69	43.67%	92	175
FLORENCE	769	308	40.05%	491	898
GEORGETOW	289	133	46.02%	205	359
GREENVILLE	2,202	892	40.51%	1,615	2,669
GREENWOOD	145	81	55.86%	110	161
HAMPTON	72	34	47.22%	54	96
HORRY	798	313	39.22%	525	957
JASPER	161	77	47.83%	121	190
KERSHAW	136	64	47.06%	107	167
LANCASTER	356	179	50.28%	297	415
LAURENS	407	176	43.24%	411	551
LEE	109	30	27.52%	36	134
LEXINGTON	810	255	31.48%	492	1,033
MCCORMICK	10	0	0.00%	0	10
MARION	152	59	38.82%	89	179
MARLBORO	112	56	50.00%	90	156
NEWBERRY	149	79	53.02%	121	177
OCONEE	206	99	48.06%	226	249
ORANGEBURG	574	300	52.26%	444	678
PICKENS	331	183	55.29%	320	351
RICHLAND	1,310	544	41.53%	849	1,650
SALUDA	108	50	46.30%	84	150
SPARTANBUR	1,726	874	50.64%	1,533	2,008
SUMTER	638	277	43.42%	487	868
UNION	162	74	45.68%	113	175
WILLIAMSBUR	172	87	50.58%	137	220
YORK	875	412	47.09%	636	1,019
CENTRAL	1	0	0.00%	0	1
STATE TOTAL	19,052	8,293	43.53%	14,081	23,121

**TABLE 4-H
POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS**

ADMISSIONS								
CATEGORY	Probation		Parole		YOA		Total	
	FY11	FY12	FY11	FY12	FY11	FY12	FY 11	FY 12
<u>RACE:</u>								
BLACK	50%	50%	64%	65%	67%	71%	53%	53%
WHITE	48%	48%	34%	33%	32%	28%	45%	46%
OTHER	2%	2%	3%	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%
<u>GENDER:</u>								
MALE	79%	78%	89%	92%	97%	96%	82%	81%
FEMALE	21%	22%	11%	8%	3%	4%	18%	19%
<u>OFFENSE TYPE:</u>								
VIOLENT	4%	4%	43%	48%	2%	2%	8%	8%
NON-VIOLENT	96%	96%	57%	52%	98%	98%	92%	92%

ACTIVES								
CATEGORY	Probation		Parole		YOA		Total	
	FY11	FY12	FY11	FY12	FY11	FY12	FY11	FY12
<u>LEVEL OF SUPERVISION:</u>								
STANDARD	77%	78%	64%	65%	64%	68%	75%	76%
HIGH RISK	19%	19%	14%	14%	16%	15%	18%	18%
INTENSIVE	1%	1%	15%	13%	18%	16%	3%	3%
SEX OFFENDER	3%	2%	7%	7%	2%	1%	3%	3%


CLOSURES								
CATEGORY	Probation		Parole		YOA		Total	
	FY11	FY12	FY11	FY12	FY11	FY12		
<u>CASE OUTCOME:</u>								
SUCCESSFUL	66%	70%	91%	91%	51%	56%	67%	71%
UNSUCCESSFUL	34%	30%	9%	9%	49%	44%	33%	29%

DRUG TESTING								
							<u>FY 11</u>	<u>FY 12</u>
INDIVIDUAL OFFENDERS TESTED							18,291	19,052
INDIVIDUALS TESTING POSITIVE							6,472	8,293
% OF INDIVIDUAL OFFENDERS TESTING POSITIVE							35.38%	43.53%
TOTAL POSITIVE TESTS							9,604	14,081
NUMBER OF TIMES OFFENDERS TESTED							22,634	23,121
Percentages may not add to 100% due to rounding.								

FIGURE 10
ADMISSIONS: A 20-YEAR COMPARISON



FIGURE 11
PERCENTAGE OF VIOLENT ADMISSIONS BY STATUS



Early Release included in Parole for FY 96-98, FY 00-11